

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58 and 60-77 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58 and 60-77 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 20, 39 and 58 have been amended.

Unless otherwise specified in the below discussion, Applicants have amended the above-referenced claims in order to provide clarity or to correct informalities in the claims. Applicants further submit that, unless discussed below, these amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims. By these amendments, Applicants do not concede that the cited art is prior to any invention now or previously claimed. Applicants further reserve the right to pursue the original versions of the claims in the future, for example, in a continuing application.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 11, 14, 20, 30, 33, 39, 49, 52, 58, 68 and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(A) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054115 naming Mack et al. as inventors (“Mack”) and further in view of “Adobe® GoLive™ 5.0 User Guide” Adobe 2000 (“Adobe”) and further in view of “Core Servlets and JavaServer Pages™” Prentice Hall 2000 (“Hall”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

In order for a claim to be rendered invalid under 35 U.S.C. §103, the subject matter of the claim as a whole would have to be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. *See* 35 U.S.C. §103(a). This requires: (1) the reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; (2) there must be some

teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine references either in the references themselves or in the knowledge of the art; and (3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *See MPEP 2143; MPEP 2143.03; In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1355-56 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Independent Claims 1, 20, 39 and 58, as amended, each contain substantially the following limitations:

selecting a tag field-based view comprising one or more applets, wherein
a view is a user interface for presentation of data; and
migrating a Cartesian coordinate-based view to the tag field-based view, wherein
the migrating comprises ...
wherein the Cartesian coordinate-based view and the tag field-based view
are each configured to provide user interfaces that display the same
data.

See Claim 1 (amended). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art fails to provide disclosure of these amended limitations.

The Office Action admits that Mack fails to provide disclosure of “selecting a tag field-based view” and instead relies upon Adobe as providing purported disclosure of this limitation. *See Office Action, p.3-4.* However, the cited section of Adobe only relates to use of the “HTML Source Editor tab [which] allows a user to view and edit the HTML of a document, with HTML being a tab-based language.” *Id.* Applicants respectfully submit that viewing of a document, as disclosed by Adobe, is not what the present Application discloses or claims a “view” to be. *See, e.g., Application, p.2 (“[v]iews are interfaces to a user in which data are presented”).* The amended “selecting” limitation incorporates the definitional language of the Application in order to clarify the distinction between the claimed “view” and that of Adobe.

Applicants further submit that the claim provides for conversion or migration of the Cartesian coordinate-based view to the selected tag field-based view. There is no disclosure in Adobe or Mack of any Cartesian coordinate-based view being converted or migrated to the HTML Source Editor tab, or the text displayed by it.

The independent claims have been further amended to make clear that the data displayed by the Cartesian coordinate-based view (i.e., user interface) is the same as the data displayed by the tag field-based view (i.e., user interface). This language thereby incorporates the disclosure of the present Application that an interface for data display which is defined in terms of Cartesian coordinates is being converted to an interface for data display defined in terms of a tag field-based view. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the sticker generator of Mack, the tab of Adobe, or the servlets of Hall provide such functionality, alone or in combination. The Office Action fails to provide any suggestion that these references provide such disclosure.

For at least these reasons, and those provided in previous Office Actions, Applicants submit that neither Mack, Adobe, nor Hall, alone or in combination, provide disclosure of all the limitations of independent Claims 1, 20, 39 and 58, as amended, and all claims depending therefrom, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5090.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan N. Geld
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,702
(512) 439-5090 [Phone]
(512) 439-5099 [Fax]